IN THE HIGH COURT OF UTTARANCHAL AT NAINITAL.

Writ Petition No. 2124 (S/S) of 2001
Old Number
Writ Petition No. 46822 of 2000

Kaushal Kishore Pandey,
Assistant Teacher (LT Grade),
Government Inter College,
Jakhal Bhardar,
District – Rudraprayag. **…….Petitioner**

V e r s u s

1. State of U.P. through Secretary, Ministry of Education, (Secondary), U.P. Government, Lucknow.
2. Union of India through Secretary, Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pension, New Delhi.
3. Director of Education, (Secondary), U.P. Allahabad.
4. Joint Director of Education Kumaon Region, Garhwal.
5. District Inspector of Schools, Rudraprayag.

…….Respondents

Hon'ble M.M. Ghildiyal, J.

1. Heard Sri C.D. Bahuguna, learned counsel for the petitioner, Smt. Anjali, learned standing counsel for Union of India on behalf of respondent no. 2 and Sri Paresh Tripathi, learned counsel for the respondents.

2. By means of this writ petition the petitioner has prayed for the following reliefs:

   a. *to issue a writ order or direction including a writ in the nature of Mandamus commanding the respondents to permit the petitioner (all Assistant Teacher, in LT Grade) to give their options (like Lecturers and Principals and all other public Government Servants) for their absorption in plain areas in the State of Uttar Pradesh (existing State of U.P.)*

b. *to issue a writ order or direction in the nature of Mandamus direction the respondent to adjust the petitioner against the existing LT grade post kin the plain areas of the State of U.P.*

c. *to issue a writ order or direction in the nature of Certiorari quashing the Government Order issued by the respondent no. 2 Union of India dated 13.09.2000 (especially clause (2) of the aforesaid guidelines, as also the consequential order issued by the State Government dated 20.09.2000 (Annexures 2 and 3 to the writ petition)*

d. *any other suitable writ, order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.*

e. *Award costs of the writ petition throughout to the petitioners.*

3. Learned standing counsel for the respondents has submitted after filing of the writ petition, petitioner was permitted to submit his option and accordingly, the grievance of the petitioner has been redressed.

4. In view of the above, writ petition has become infructuous. As such, writ petition is dismissed as infructuous.

(M.M. Ghildiyal, J)

July 04, 2006
SKSharma